

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **Planning and Traffic Committee** held on **8 February 2011** at the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

The meeting commenced at 8.00pm.

Present: Mr C Snowling (Chairman)
Mr A Gomme (Vice Chairman)
Mr W Blunden
Mrs M Hersey
Mr M Leach
Mrs V Upton
Mr S Willcox

Also Present: 25 members of the public

In Attendance: Mrs S Kolien

547. WELCOME AND EMERGENCY ANNOUNCEMENTS

547.1 The Chairman welcomed those present and announced the emergency procedure for the King Edward Hall.

548. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

548.1 Apologies were received from Councillor Nicolle and the reasons accepted.

549. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

549.1 Cllr Hersey stated that she reserved the right to express a different opinion from that given at this meeting, when present at meetings of the Mid Sussex District Council's (MSDC's) Central Area Planning Committee (CAPC) or at any other meeting which subsequently considered any matter discussed at the present meeting, having seen the Officers' reports and heard representations from members of the public and fellow members. Cllr Snowling stated that, if he were called upon to substitute at the CAPC, he reserved the right to express a different opinion from that given at this meeting should the CAPC agenda include any matter discussed at the present meeting, having seen the Officers' reports and heard representations from members of the public and fellow members.

Cllr Gomme said that he had a personal interest in Item 5(xii) – 11/00164/FUL at 9 Finches Park Road, as he was a neighbour. He advised that he would not take part in the debate and that he would leave the room whilst it was in progress.

550. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

550.1 None.

551. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE HELD ON 18 JANUARY 2011

551.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 18 January 2011. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

552. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS REFERRED TO THE PARISH COUNCIL BY MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION

552.1 For each application, the observations of the members who had specifically studied the plans were read out before any public comments and discussion by the Committee. It was **AGREED**, for the benefit of members of the public present at the meeting, to rearrange the order in which the planning applications were to be considered.

552.2 11/00164/FUL – 9 FINCHES PARK ROAD
REDEVELOPMENT OF ONE DETACHED HOUSE TO PROVIDE 2 x THREE-BEDROOMED
DETACHED HOUSES WITH ATTACHED GARAGE AND ON PLOT PARKING.

Cllr Gomme left the meeting at 8.06pm.

There had been considerable opposition to this planning application by local residents. Two members of the public who opposed the application were invited to speak.

Mr Campling suggested that the current application failed on all previous points. Of particular concern was increased danger to traffic due to the size and configuration of the road, the density of the proposed development and flooding issues. He also referred to the application of PPG1 and PPG 3 in the light of a recent High Court determination against a developer.

Mr Jones stated that neighbours would be overlooked and lose their privacy. He also expressed concern that, if approved, the application could start a precedent for similar developments elsewhere in the village.

Mr John Jesson on behalf of Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS) advised that, even though the reduced number of dwellings now proposed would lessen the impact of what was proposed previously, the Society still had major concerns. In particular, the proposal for two dwellings to replace one was not sustainable and to remove the existing dwelling would be contrary to PPS 1. Materials proposed for the exteriors did not harmonize with other dwellings in the neighbourhood. The new designs were inappropriate and contrary to Local Plan Policy B1. He also raised concerns regarding traffic issues and the visibility of the access to Plot 2 for drivers travelling from Hickmans Lane towards By Sunte.

Members of the Planning and Traffic Committee were invited to comment and all agreed with the points that had been raised.

AGREED RESPONSE: “Strong Objection. The Planning and Traffic Committee cannot support this application for the reasons given by the Central Area Planning Committee for their refusal of the last application. Additionally, it is felt that the proposal for two dwellings to replace one is even less sustainable than the previous application to replace one dwelling with three. Should, nevertheless, Planning Officers be minded to grant it, the Planning and Traffic Committee urges that the application should be considered by the Central Area Planning Committee.”

Cllr Gomme re-joined the meeting at 8.15pm.

552.3 10/03179/FUL – 17-19 DENMANS LANE
REFURBISHMENT OF AN EXISTING PROPERTY AND THE ERECTION OF A NEW
CONTEMPORARY RESIDENCE TO THE REAR.

One member of the public who opposed the application was invited to speak.

Mr Taylor noted that the latest planning application referred to the removal of “old workshops”. These had, in fact, been knocked down a few years ago and did not form any part of the current application. The proposed house was too big for the site and the materials, in particular a curved metal roof, were out of keeping with other properties in Lindfield and would impact on the Conservation Area. Of

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

particular concern was the provision of inadequate parking for the new house and the impact that this would have on the access road.

Mr Jesson (LPS) said that the Society had already raised objections to the previous application for a contemporary dwelling. It now had other concerns, notably the proposal to use soakaways to dispose of surface water, as heavy compacted clay and sandstone lay just below the surface in some areas. There was also concern about the survival of trees within the Conservation Area at the rear boundary. Mr Jesson suggested that the application should be refused as contrary to Local Plan Policies B1 and B12.

Members of the Planning and Traffic Committee were in agreement with all the comments made and were particularly concerned about the impact on the Conservation Area.

AGREED RESPONSE: "Objection to this proposal on the grounds of its incompatibility to the site. The Planning and Traffic Committee's views have not changed since the previous submission. It is contrary to the design statement submitted by IDL. It is considered that the design is wholly inappropriate to the proposed setting and contrary to the Village Design Statement. It will also have a significant impact on the Conservation Area. Additionally, parking facilities for the proposed new house appear inadequate and may result in illegal parking in the privately owned access lane to the front of the property."

- 552.4 10/03809/FUL – SPRINGFIELD, SPRING LANE
FOLLOWING APPROVAL OF REPLACEMENT DWELLING (LF/10/03569/FUL), PROPOSED
DORMERS, MINOR EXTERNAL CHANGES AND NEW DRIVEWAY. DWELLING IS UNDER
CONSTRUCTION.

The applicant, Mr Skinner, was present, but did not speak as there were no objections to the application.

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection."

- 552.5 11/00118/LDC – 47 FIELDWAY
NEW DWELLING AS OUTLINED IN PLANNING PERMISSION LF/05/01232/FUL DRAWINGS BY
ECOTECTURE 21/3/REV. A, 21/2/REV. B, HARD LANDSCAPING PLAN 21/20 AND REVISED PLOT
LOCATION PLAN. THIS IS AN APPLICATION TO ESTABLISH WHETHER THE DEVELOPMENT IS
LAWFUL: THIS WILL BE A LEGAL DECISION WHERE THE PLANNING MERITS OF THE PROPOSED
USE CANNOT BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.

A resident of Fieldway, Mr Ewen, was able to provide Members with a full history of this application and was of the view that no meaningful work had ever been started.

Mr Jesson (LPS) agreed that no work appeared to have been carried out. He felt that the application should be challenged so that a Full Application could be resubmitted if that was the wish of the applicant.

Members of the Planning and Traffic Committee also agreed that there was no evidence of work having commenced.

AGREED RESPONSE: "Although a matter of law, the Planning and Traffic Committee is surprised from the evidence before it that it is suggested that any work has been started at the property which would legally constitute development of the site."

- 552.6 10/03456/FUL & 10/3457/LBC – RED LION, 60 HIGH STREET
RELOCATE THE LADIES AND GENTS TOILETS AND BOILER ROOM TO FIRST FLOOR,
RELOCATE THE CATERING KITCHEN TO THE REAR OF THE PROPERTY WITH THE INCLUSION
OF AN EXTERNAL CHILLER AND FREEZER ROOM. A NEW LOBBY WILL BE FORMED TO ACCESS
THE GARDEN, WITH THE DOOR TO THE DISABLED TOILET BEING RELOCATED INTO THE
NEWLY FORMED LOBBY. ALTERATIONS TO THE BAR SERVERY TO FORM A GLASS WASH
AREA. AMENDED PLANS RECEIVED 10.01.11 SHOWING INSTALLATION OF TWO EXTRACTION
UNITS ON THE NORTH ELEVATION TOWARDS THE REAR OF THE BUILDING.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Mr Jesson (LPS) advised that the Society's main concerns related to the installation of obscured glazing which was expected to be needed for windows at the front and rear of the building for toilet facilities proposed for the first floor. This would cause harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and to the setting of other Listed Buildings, contrary to Local Plan Policies B1, B10 and B12. For the same reasons, the Society believed that the kitchen fumes extractor units proposed on the roof would be unsympathetic to the character and appearance of the Red Lion and the Conservation Area.

Members shared the concerns regarding the extractor units and felt that this was a matter that should be investigated by an Environmental Health Officer.

AGREED RESPONSE: "Whilst the Planning and Traffic Committee has no objection, it wishes to stand by its previous comments to these applications. There are also concerns regarding the extraction units and it is suggested that a report should be obtained from the Environmental Health Officer on the impact that these might have on nearby residents."

552.7 Cllr M Allen joined the meeting at 8.36pm and was invited to sit at the table.

552.8 10/03958/FUL – THE LONG HOUSE, 6 THE WILDERNESS
PROPOSED CONSERVATORY AT REAR.

Mr Jesson (LPS) said that, although not within the Lindfield Conservation Area, the site was close to one of the most sensitive parts of it and close to one of the most important groups of Listed Buildings. The proposals seemed to respect the location.

Members were happy with the application, but noted the concerns that building supplies may be delivered via Francis Road.

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection, but the concerns of Francis Road residents that it might be thought appropriate to bring materials on site via that road are noted. The Parish Council understands that Francis Road is not an adopted highway."

552.9 10/03703/FUL – 7 BACKWOODS CLOSE
DEMOLISH EXISTING GARAGE AND CONSTRUCT NEW TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION WITH
FRONT AND REAR ROOF DORMERS. TWO REAR FACING ROOF DORMERS TO EXISTING ROOF.
CONSERVATORY TO REAR. (AMENDED BLOCK PLAN RECEIVED 13.01.11 SHOWING
NEIGHBOUR'S EXTENSION).

AGREED RESPONSE: "Previous comments on this application still stand. No objection, subject to materials matching."

552.10 10/03922/LBC – ST ANN'S, BLACK HILL
FORMATION OF A NEW OPENING BETWEEN TWO ROOMS TO PROVIDE AN ENLARGED LIVING
ROOM, TOGETHER WITH INSTALLATION OF A BATHROOM, MINOR INTERNAL ALTERATIONS,
AND SOME EXTERNAL RENDERING OF THE BRICKWORK. DESCRIPTION AMENDED 10.01.11 TO
INCLUDE: EXTERNAL WALLS TO BE PAINTED OFF-WHITE FROM EXISTING YELLOW.

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection to the internal works, or to the external colour changing from yellow to off white."

552.11 11/00037/FUL – 35 HIGH BEECH LANE
A SINGLE STOREY ADDITION TO THE REAR OF THE PROPERTY TO FORM A NEW KITCHEN AND
GLAZED LINK, OTHER MINOR INTERNAL WORKS.

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection. Noted that the property lies within an Area of Townscape Character."

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

552.12 11/00105/FUL – 40 LUXFORD ROAD
SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

AGREED RESPONSE: “No objection.”

552.13 10/03833 /FUL – 36 HICKMANS LANE
NEW CONSERVATORY TO REAR OF PROPERTY (EXCEEDING 3-METRE DEPTH).

AGREED RESPONSE: “No objection. Although unable to speak with the immediate neighbours, it appeared unlikely that the proposed conservatory would adversely affect them. Although the pitch of the conservatory would be different from the others on the applicant’s house, this did not seem to present a difficulty.”

552.14 11/00126/FUL – 12 DENMANS LANE
TWO-STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND ATTACHED GARAGE TO REAR.

For the benefit of those present, the pre-application advice from the Mid Sussex District Council Planning Officer was read out.

AGREED RESPONSE: “No objection, subject to the pre-application advice being followed.”

552.15 Cllr Allen left the meeting at this point.

553. TO RECEIVE REPORTS ON ANY SIGNIFICANT PLANNING DECISIONS MADE BY MSDC AND THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE AND TO AGREE ANY FURTHER ACTION WHICH MAY NEED TO BE TAKEN BEFORE THE NEXT MEETING.

553.1 The list had been circulated. **NOTED:**

- That the planning application, LF/10/03783/LBC, at 99–99a High Street (Doodie Stark) had been given Listed Building Consent on 1 February 2011 for “Amendments to the existing approved works (references 10/02352/FUL and 10/02353/LBC) to include a change to the material for the flat roof covering, a soil vent pipe terminal at high level, and a heating/cooling unit to the proposed flat roof. It is further proposed to retain the existing brick flank wall fronting onto Hickmans Lane”.

554 TO CONSIDER ACTIVITY ON THE LIMES DEVELOPMENT, ANY DOCUMENTS RELATING THERETO AND AGREE ANY ACTION WHICH MAY NEED TO BE TAKEN BEFORE THE NEXT MEETING.

554.1 Cllr Gomme advised that there had been an exchange of emails between the Deputy Clerk and the Mid Sussex District Council Planning Officer, but as yet the issue of the street lighting at the entrance remained unresolved.

555. TO DISCUSS MATTERS RAISED BY MR NEIL KERSLAKE IN HIS LETTER OF 4 JANUARY 2011 RELATING TO PLANNING PROCEDURES AND PLANNING POLICY MATTERS.

555.1 Certain issues had been raised by Mr Kerslake at a previous meeting. He had subsequently written on the matter and his concerns could be divided into three main points:

- *Comments from the Parish Council on applications for Listed Building Consent should only be made in terms of the relevant policies for Listed Buildings. Comments on other considerations belong in the response to the FUL application.*

A FUL application is not always necessary as the work might be permitted development but for the fact that it concerns a Listed Building. The comments raised by Mr Kerslake had been prompted by a debate on an application that had attracted some attention. It was felt that it would have been difficult to stick solely to the LBC application when it was known that the FUL application, although not yet received,

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

would have been identical and may have led to the public believing that the Committee was not responding to some of the issues.

- *The Planning and Traffic Committee questioned the District Council's decision to determine a LBC application before a FUL application has been submitted.*

It was suggested that the Parish Council should write to the District Council saying that it was concerned about the practice of splitting the timing of LBC and FUL applications. Whilst they would still be considered separately, it would be helpful if they could be received at the same time.

- *Where there are objections to a planning application in the Conservation Area for which the officer is recommending approval, the Parish Council's letter should ask the planning officers to put the application to committee and the letter should be copied to Ward Councillors asking them to consider calling the application in for determination by the Committee.*

The only people who can ask for an application to be called in are members of the District Council. The Parish Council can only suggest that this should be done. The relevant planning officer could be asked if a matter was likely to be determined under delegated powers.

555.2 Cllr Leach left the meeting at 9.05pm.

556. ANY OTHER BUSINESS, ARISING AFTER THE PREPARATION OF THIS AGENDA, WHICH THE CHAIRMAN AGREES TO TAKE AS URGENT. SUCH MATTERS WILL BE FOR NOTING OR DEFERRAL TO A FUTURE MEETING ONLY.

556.1 There was no other business.

On conclusion of this part of the meeting, a further 15 minutes was set aside to allow members of the public to ask questions/make comments.

Mr Jesson advised that non material applications needed to be accessible on the Mid Sussex District Council's web site. He was concerned that a certain area of planning applications was not available to the public. Cllr Snowling confirmed that he would look into this issue.

The meeting concluded at 9.10pm.
